



1 Pursuant to Civ. Local Rule 3-13, plaintiffs Michael Brauch and Andrew  
2 Meimes (“Plaintiffs”) identify the following cases in which substantially similar antitrust  
3 law violations are alleged to have occurred due to Intel Corporation’s (“Intel”) use of its  
4 substantial market power to unlawfully maintain its monopoly by engaging in a relentless  
5 campaign to coerce customers to refrain from dealing with Advanced Micro Devices, which  
6 resulted in customers paying higher prices for x86 microprocessors and left them with fewer  
7 buying choices for such microprocessors.

8 Each of the following cases therefore relates to the general subject matter  
9 alleged in this action.

- 10 1. *Salpeter, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00575, filed in the United  
11 States District Court for the District of Delaware on August 8, 2005,  
12 and assigned to Judge Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
- 13 2. *Roach v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00617, filed in the United States  
14 District Court for the District of Delaware on August 22, 2005. This  
15 case has not been assigned to a judge as of August 23, 2005.
- 16 3. *Herroeder-Perras v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00617, filed in the  
17 United States District Court for the District of Delaware on  
18 August 22, 2005. This case has not been assigned to a judge as of  
19 August 23, 2005.

20 On July 11, 2005, Plaintiffs filed a motion with the Judicial Panel for  
21 Multidistrict Litigation (“Judicial Panel”), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407, requesting that all  
22 pending and subsequently filed actions in this and other district courts be transferred and  
23 coordinated or consolidated in the Northern District of California for pretrial proceedings.  
24 On August 5, 2005, Plaintiffs filed a Reply Submission with the Judicial Panel withdrawing  
25 their §1407 motion and instead advocating transfer to the District of Delaware. A copy of  
26 the §1407 motion was lodged with the clerk of this Court on July 11, 2005 and a copy of  
27 the Reply Submission was lodged with the clerk of this Court on August 5, 2005. The  
28 Plaintiffs believe that coordination of the foregoing cases pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407

(Multi-District Litigation Procedures) will avoid conflicts, conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action.

Dated: August 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alex C. Turan

Michael P. Lehmann

Thomas P. Dove

Alex C. Turan

The Furth Firm, LLP

225 Bush Street, 15th Floor

San Francisco, California 94104-4249

Telephone: (415) 433-2070

Facsimile: (415) 982-2076

Francis O. Scarpulla (41059)

Law Offices Of Francis O. Scarpulla

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 788-7210

Facsimile: (415) 788-0707

Craig C. Corbitt (83251)

Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette, LLP

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 693-0700

Facsimile: (415) 693-0770

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Michael Brauch and  
Andrew Meimes